

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, last November polls in Minnesota said it was a two-man race for governor. Beam me up. Who were they polling? Bullwinkle? Jesse Ventura, the third candidate, actually won due to the debates and quite frankly he is a breath of fresh air in our country.

That is the reason, another reason, why I have reintroduced my bill that would require that all presidential debates must include every candidate that has a mathematical chance of winning. They qualify on enough State ballots. They qualify for matching funds. They give the American people a choice, and they make the two major party candidates tell us what they really feel.

I yield back Bullwinkle, and I yield back the fact that the Federal Election Commission can do this without my bill.

□ 1015

U.S. MISSES BOAT ON LATIN AMERICAN TRADE

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard the old expression, "You snooze, you lose." An article in yesterday's Washington Times brings that old expression to mind. It was entitled, EU, that is European Union, Latin Trade Zone Doesn't Include U.S.

It seems that while our government has dawdled, European governments have worked hard to cultivate trade relationships in our own backyard. Latin American countries and the European Union worked toward lowering trade barriers, and our government stands idly by.

Trade means jobs. Trade means economic growth. Trade means a higher standard of living for the American people. Let us not continue to sit back and watch while Europe and Latin America reap the benefits of an aggressive trade policy. Let us work with our trading partners to tear down barriers and open up markets for American products around the world. Mr. Speaker, we can ill afford to be pushed out of the international trade markets. Let us get back in the game.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would simply like to congratulate the gentleman on his remarks; and I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's statement.

THE PRESIDENT'S MEDICARE PROPOSAL

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, it is time that this Congress gets smart and starts to invest in our 39 million Medicare beneficiaries. I urge my colleagues

to stop hemming and hawing and take heed of the needs of our seniors.

Plainly speaking, the President has a plan to save Medicare by dedicating 15 percent of the Federal budget surplus. The plan modernizes Medicare by adding a vital drug benefit, eliminating the copay on preventive services, providing a buy-in option for the vulnerable and offering needed assistance for low-income beneficiaries. The Republican leadership has no Medicare plan and really has only one choice. Roll up your sleeves, work with the Democrats, save Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, we need to protect our seniors. We can do it and we can do it now.

COMPASSIONATE CONSERVATISM

(Mr. ROGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Joseph Jacobs wrote an exceptional book about "compassionate conservatism," a slogan today adopted by the distinguished governor of Texas, George W. Bush. The concept reminds me that many liberals go through their lives thinking that they are compassionate because of their willingness to spend other people's money.

So often there is absolutely no recognition from liberals that conservatives share many of the same ultimate goals. But we certainly disagree over the best ways in which to achieve them. That is why we hear day after day on the House floor the motives of conservatives attacked. In my view, the liberal version of compassion has done more harm and has had more devastating consequences on the less fortunate than the most fiscally conservative lawmaker ever could have. Theirs is the philosophy of dependence on government. We conservatives share the philosophy of celebrating individual self-reliance. Compassion is not a product of policy. It is a product of the human heart. There is no compassion in destroying the motivation of the less fortunate to achieve, to grow and to prosper.

MEDICARE

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, since the bipartisan Medicare Commission met, the Medicare debate has come front and center. Republicans want to improve the access of seniors to prescription drugs. No senior should have to worry about whether they can afford the medicines they need to stay healthy. We need to work in a bipartisan manner to solve this problem, putting politics aside. This issue is too important.

The President has recently entered this debate, and we are awaiting bill

language, but it brings up some interesting questions. What does the President's plan do? Does it target those most in need? Does it threaten the solvency of Medicare? Does it take money out of the Social Security Trust Fund? Who pays? Will seniors pay higher premiums? Will the Government set price controls? Will all Americans face higher taxes? Will payments to hospitals, doctors and other health care providers be cut? Does the plan address holistic medicine and Medicare fraud, waste and abuse? Will Medicare innovation be threatened? Will seniors be able to participate based upon their choice?

What we need to focus on is providing drug coverage, solvency and choice to our seniors. That is what we will be working for.

PASS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TAX CREDIT

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it is July. Half a year is gone. Next week we will go home to tell our constituents what the House has accomplished. What will we say? If we are candid, we will have to say, not enough.

We have not acted to protect patients' rights. We have not acted to reform campaign finance. We have not acted to help communities respond to growth and sprawl. We have not even done an easy thing like renewing the research and development tax credit. It expired last night.

We need to do better. In fact, we need to make the credit permanent and broaden it. A temporary credit like the one that expired last night is a less effective credit because researchers cannot count on it. Making it permanent would end this uncertainty. A broader credit would benefit small businesses and high-tech entrepreneurial startups. Under the law that just expired, these firms did not benefit. We should go further and use the credit to promote collaboration between the Federal Government, the private sector and universities like the University of Colorado in my district.

Half the year is gone, but half remains. We need to stop wasting time and missing deadlines. Let us pass this tax credit as soon as possible.

TOP TEN TERRIBLE TAX ACT

(Mr. TANCREDO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon consider legislation to implement the budget resolution's call for \$778 billion in tax relief over the next 10 years. While I believe today's complicated and cumbersome Tax Code needs to be completely replaced, this will take time as the American people debate alternative tax systems. In the meantime, we can take a major step